

SYMMETRY OF SOLUTIONS OF SOME SEMILINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH SINGULAR NONLINEARITIES

A. CANINO*, M. GRANDINETTI* AND B. SCIUNZI*

ABSTRACT. We consider positive solutions to the singular semilinear elliptic equation $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + f(u)$, in bounded smooth domains, with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions.

We provide some weak and strong maximum principles for the $H_0^1(\Omega)$ part of the solution (the solution u does generally not belong to $H_0^1(\Omega)$), that allow to deduce symmetry and monotonicity properties of the solutions, via the *Moving Plane Method*.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study symmetry and monotonicity properties of the solutions to the problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + f(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma > 0$, Ω is a bounded smooth domain and $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$. Our main results will be proved under the following assumption

(H_p) f is locally Lipschitz continuous, non-decreasing, $f(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$ and $f(0) \geq 0$.

As a model problem we may consider solutions to $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + u^q$ with $q > 0$.

Since the pioneer results in [7] and [17], singular semilinear elliptic equations have been considered by several authors. We refer to [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16].

The variational characterization of problem (1.1) is not trivial. In fact, already in the case $f \equiv 0$, the condition $\gamma < 3$ is necessary to have solutions in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and to have the associated energy functional $I \neq +\infty$, see [14]. A first attempt in this direction can be found in [11] in the case $\gamma \leq 1$.

Later in [5] a general approach was developed for any $\gamma > 0$. The main idea in [5], that will be a key ingredient in the present paper, is a translation of the energy functional and of the functions space used, based on the decomposition of the solutions of (1.1) as

$$(1.2) \quad u = u_0 + w$$

Date: March 13, 2013.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35B01, 35J61, 35J75.

Key words and phrases. Singular semilinear equations, symmetry of solutions, moving plane method.

where $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ is the solution to the problem:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_0 = \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The solution u_0 is unique (see Lemma 2.8 in [5]) and can be found via a sub-super solution method like in [5] or via a truncation argument as in [3]. It follows by the comparison argument used in the proof of [5] that the solution u_0 is continuous up to the boundary and is bounded away from zero in the interior of Ω . This latter information also follows by [3] where the solution u_0 is obtained as the limit of an increasing sequence of positive solutions to a regularized problem.

The equation $-\Delta u_0 = \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma}$ consequently can be understood in the weak distributional sense with test functions with compact support in Ω , that is

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\Omega} (Du_0, D\varphi) dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi}{u_0^\gamma} dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega).$$

Actually, the solution is fulfilled in the classical sense in the interior of Ω by standard regularity results, since u_0 is strictly positive in the interior of the domain.

In any case, taking into account [14], for $\gamma \geq 3$ u_0 does not belong to $H_0^1(\Omega)$, hence u does not belong to $H_0^1(\Omega)$ too.

The proof of our symmetry result is based on the well known *Moving Plane Method* (see [15]), that was used in a clever way in the celebrated paper [9] in the semilinear nondegenerate case. Actually our proof is more similar to the one of [1] and is based on the weak comparison principle in small domains.

Because of the singular nature of our problem, we have to take care of two difficulties, namely:

- u does not belong to $H_0^1(\Omega)$,
- $\frac{1}{s^\gamma} + f(s)$ is not Lipschitz continuous at zero.

This causes that a straightforward modification of the moving plane technique is not possible in our setting and for this reason we need a new technique based on the decomposition in (1.2).

Let us state our symmetry result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be a solution to (1.1) with f satisfying (H_p) . Assume that the domain Ω is strictly convex w.r.t. the ν -direction ($\nu \in S^{N-1}$) and symmetric w.r.t. T_0^ν , where*

$$T_0^\nu = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu = 0\}.$$

Then u is symmetric w.r.t. T_0^ν and non-decreasing w.r.t. the ν -direction in Ω_0^ν , where

$$\Omega_0^\nu = \{x \in \Omega : x \cdot \nu < 0\}.$$

Moreover, if Ω is a ball, then u is radially symmetric with $\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(r) < 0$ for $r \neq 0$.

For the reader's convenience, we describe here below the scheme of the proof.

- (i) Since, by [3], u_0 is the limit of a sequence u_n of solutions to a regularized problem (3.7), we deduce symmetry and monotonicity properties of u_n , and consequently of u_0 , applying the moving plane procedure in a standard way to the regularized problem (3.7).
- (ii) By (i), recalling the decomposition in (1.2): $u = u_0 + w$, we are reduced to prove symmetry and monotonicity properties of w . To do this, in Section 4, we prove some comparison principles for w needed in the application of the moving plane procedure.
- (iii) In Section 5, we carry out the adaptation of the moving plane procedure to the study of the monotonicity and symmetry of w . It is worth emphasizing that the moving plane procedure is applied in our approach only to the $H_0^1(\Omega)$ part of u . Note also that Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 6 exploiting the more general result Proposition 5.1.

2. NOTATIONS

To state the next results we need some notations. Let ν be a direction in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $|\nu| = 1$. Given a real number λ we set

$$T_\lambda^\nu = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu = \lambda\},$$

$$\Omega_\lambda^\nu = \{x \in \Omega : x \cdot \nu < \lambda\}$$

and

$$x_\lambda^\nu = R_\lambda^\nu(x) = x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu,$$

that is the reflection trough the hyperplane T_λ^ν . Moreover we set

$$(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)' = R_\lambda^\nu(\Omega_\lambda^\nu).$$

Observe that $(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)'$ may be not contained in Ω . Also we take

$$a(\nu) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} x \cdot \nu.$$

When $\lambda > a(\nu)$, since Ω_λ^ν is nonempty, we set

$$\Lambda_1(\nu) = \{\lambda : (\Omega_t^\nu)' \subset \Omega \text{ for any } a(\nu) < t \leq \lambda\},$$

and

$$\lambda_1(\nu) = \sup \Lambda_1(\nu).$$

Moreover we set

$$u_\lambda^\nu(x) = u(x_\lambda^\nu),$$

for any $a(\nu) < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(\nu)$.

Recalling the decomposition of the solutions of (1.1) (see (1.2)) as

$$u = u_0 + w,$$

we set

$$u_{0\lambda}^\nu(x) = u_0(x_\lambda^\nu),$$

and

$$w_\lambda^\nu(x) = w(x_\lambda^\nu).$$

3. SYMMETRY PROPERTIES OF u_0

Basing on the construction of the solution u_0 of (1.3) we prove in this section some useful symmetry and monotonicity results for u_0 .

Proposition 3.1. *Let $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be the solution to (1.3). Then, for any*

$$a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$$

we have

$$(3.5) \quad u_0(x) < u_{0\lambda}^\nu(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\lambda^\nu$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu.$$

Proof. Let $u_n \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ be the unique solution to

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_n = \frac{1}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^\gamma} & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\ u_n > 0 & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The existence of u_n was proved in [3] and the uniqueness follows by [5]. Since the problem is no more singular, by standard elliptic estimates it follows that $u_n \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. Therefore we can use the moving plane technique exactly as in [1, 9] to deduce that the statement of our proposition holds true for each u_n . By [3] u_n converges to u_0 a.e. as n tends to infinity and therefore (3.5) follows passing to the limit. Finally in the same way

$$\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu,$$

and therefore (3.6) follows via the strong maximum principle. $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.1, we get

Proposition 3.2. *Let $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be the solution of (1.3) and assume that the domain Ω is strictly convex w.r.t. the ν -direction ($\nu \in S^{N-1}$) and symmetric w.r.t. T_0^ν . Then u_0 is symmetric w.r.t. T_0^ν and non-decreasing w.r.t. the ν -direction in Ω_0^ν . Moreover, if Ω is a ball, then u_0 is radially symmetric with $\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial r}(r) < 0$ for $r \neq 0$.*

4. COMPARISON PRINCIPLES

Let us start with the following

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\gamma > 0$. Consider the function*

$$g_\gamma(x, y, z, h) := x^\gamma(x+y)^\gamma(z+h)^\gamma + x^\gamma z^\gamma(z+h)^\gamma - z^\gamma(x+y)^\gamma(z+h)^\gamma - x^\gamma z^\gamma(x+y)^\gamma$$

and the domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ defined by

$$D := \left\{ (x, y, z, h) \mid 0 \leq x \leq z; 0 \leq h \leq y \right\}.$$

Then it follows that $g_\gamma \leq 0$ in D .

Proof. Since $x \leq z$, by direct calculation we get

$$\frac{\partial g_\gamma}{\partial y}(x, y, z, h) = \gamma x^\gamma (x+y)^{\gamma-1} (z+h)^\gamma - \gamma z^\gamma (x+y)^{\gamma-1} (z+h)^\gamma - \gamma x^\gamma z^\gamma (x+y)^{\gamma-1} \leq 0$$

Therefore we are reduced to prove that $g_\gamma \leq 0$ in $D \cap \{h = y\}$, that is

$$g_\gamma(x, y, z, y) = x^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma + x^\gamma z^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma - z^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma - x^\gamma z^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma \leq 0.$$

For $x = 0$ the thesis follows immediately. For $x > 0$ we note that

$$g_\gamma(x, y, z, y) = -\left(\frac{1}{x^\gamma} - \frac{1}{z^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(z+y)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(x+y)^\gamma}\right)(x^\gamma z^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma)$$

and the conclusion follows exploiting the fact that, for $0 < x \leq z$ fixed, the function

$$\tilde{g}_\gamma(t) := x^{-\gamma} - z^{-\gamma} + (z+t)^{-\gamma} - (x+t)^{-\gamma}$$

is increasing in $[0, \infty)$ and $\tilde{g}_\gamma(0) = 0$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be a solution to problem (1.1) with $\gamma > 0$. Assume that Ω is a bounded smooth domain and that f is locally Lipschitz continuous, $f(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$ and $f(0) \geq 0$. Let w be given by (1.2).*

Then it follows

$$w > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

Proof. Since $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ and $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$, then $w \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$. By hypothesis on f , it follows that u is a super-solution (following Definition 2.5 in [5]) to the equation

$$-\Delta v = \frac{1}{v^\gamma}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.8 in [5] we get that

$$u \geq u_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{and therefore} \quad w \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Now let us show that $w > 0$ in the interior of Ω via the maximum principle exploited in regions where the problem is not singular. More precisely let us assume by contradiction that there exists a point $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $w(x_0) = 0$ and let $r = r(x_0) > 0$ such that $B_r(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega$. We have, in the classical sense, in $B_r(x_0)$

$$-\Delta w = -\Delta u + \Delta u_0 = \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} + f(u) - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} \geq \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma}.$$

Since $u_0(x_0) > 0$ we can assume that u_0 is positive in $B_r(x_0)$. Therefore we get that

$$\frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} = c(x) (u_0 + w - u_0) = c(x) w$$

for some bounded coefficient $c(x)$. Thus there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} + \Lambda w \geq 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$, so that

$$-\Delta w + \Lambda w \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_r(x_0).$$

By the strong maximum principle we get $w \equiv 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$ and by a covering argument that $w \equiv 0$ in Ω . But $w \equiv 0$ in Ω implies $f = 0$ and we get a contradiction. □

Proposition 4.3 (A strong maximum principle). *Let $a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$ and Ω' a subdomain of Ω'_λ . Assume that $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ is a solution to (1.1) with f satisfying (H_p) . Let w be given by (1.2) and assume that*

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'.$$

Then it holds the alternative

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega' \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'.$$

Proof. Let us use the short hand notation $w_\nu := \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}$ and $u_{0\nu} := \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}$. Since $f' \geq 0$ a.e.¹ by assumption (H_p) , $u_{0\nu} \geq 0$ in Ω' by Proposition 3.1, $u \geq u_0$ by Lemma 4.2 and finally $w_\nu \geq 0$ in Ω' by assumption, differentiating the equation in (1.1) we get that w_ν solves

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_\nu &= -\frac{\gamma}{u^{\gamma+1}} w_\nu + f'(u)(w_\nu + u_{0\nu}) + \gamma \left(\frac{1}{u_0^{\gamma+1}} - \frac{1}{u^{\gamma+1}} \right) u_{0\nu} \\ &\geq -\frac{\gamma}{u^{\gamma+1}} w_\nu, \end{aligned}$$

We recall now that u is bounded away from zero in Ω' , and therefore we find $\Lambda > 0$ such that

$$-\Delta w_\nu \geq -\frac{\gamma}{u^{\gamma+1}} w_\nu \geq -\Lambda w_\nu,$$

so that the conclusion follows by the standard strong maximum principle [10]. □

Proposition 4.4 (Weak Comparison Principle in small domains). *Let $a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$ and $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega'_\lambda$. Assume that $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ is a solution to (1.1) with f satisfying (H_p) . Let w be given by (1.2) and assume that*

$$w \leq w'_\lambda \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega'.$$

Then there exists a positive constant $\delta = \delta(u, f)$ such that, if $\mathcal{L}(\Omega') \leq \delta$, then

$$w \leq w'_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'.$$

Proof. We have

$$(4.8) \quad -\Delta(u_0 + w) = \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} + f(u_0 + w) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$(4.9) \quad -\Delta(u_{0\lambda}' + w'_\lambda) = \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}' + w'_\lambda)^\gamma} + f(u_{0\lambda}' + w'_\lambda) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

Since $(w - w'_\lambda)^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega')$ we can consider a sequence of positive functions ψ_n such that

$$\psi_n \in C_c^\infty(\Omega') \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_n \xrightarrow{H_0^1(\Omega')} (w - w'_\lambda)^+.$$

We can also assume that $\text{supp } \psi_n \subseteq \text{supp } (w - w'_\lambda)^+$. We plug ψ_n into the weak formulation of (4.8) and (4.9) and subtracting we get

¹Note that, even if f' exist a.e., the term $f'(u)(w_\nu + u_{0\nu})$ makes sense in the weak Sobolev meaning thanks to Stampacchia's Theorem.

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.10) \quad & \int_{\Omega'} (D(u_0 + w) - D(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu), D\psi_n) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega'} \left(\frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} + f(u_0 + w) - \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that u_0 and $u_{0\lambda}^\nu$ solve (1.3) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.11) \quad & \int_{\Omega'} (D(w - w_\lambda^\nu), D\psi_n) dx = \int_{\Omega'} \left(\frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} \right) \psi_n dx \\
&+ \int_{\Omega'} \left(f(u_0 + w) - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $u_0 \leq u_{0\lambda}^\nu$ in Ω_λ^ν and $w \geq w_\lambda^\nu$ on the support of ψ_n , by applying Lemma 4.1 with $u_0 = x$, $w = y$, $u_{0\lambda}^\nu = z$ and $w_\lambda^\nu = h$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& (u_0)^\gamma (u_0 + w)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma + (u_0)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma \\
& - (u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma (u_0 + w)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma - (u_0)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma (u_0 + w)^\gamma \leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

and then $\left(\frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} \right) \leq 0$.

Therefore, by assumption (H_p) , we find a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.12) \quad & \int_{\Omega'} (D(w - w_\lambda^\nu), D\psi_n) dx \leq \int_{\Omega'} \left(f(u_0 + w) - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega'} \left(f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w) - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx \leq C \int_{\Omega'} (w - w_\lambda^\nu) \psi_n dx.
\end{aligned}$$

We now pass to the limit for $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega'} |D(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega'} |(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx$$

and by Poincaré inequality

$$\int_{\Omega'} |D(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx \leq C C_p(\Omega') \int_{\Omega'} |D(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx.$$

For δ small it follows that $C C_p(\Omega') < 1$ which shows that actually $(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+ = 0$ and the thesis follows. □

Lemma 4.5 (Strong Comparison Principle). *Let $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be a solution to problem (1.1), with f satisfying (H_p) . Let w be given by (1.2) and assume that, for some $a(\nu) < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(\Omega)$, we have*

$$w \leq w_\lambda^\nu \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\lambda^\nu.$$

Then $w < w_\lambda^\nu$ in Ω_λ^ν unless $w \equiv w_\lambda^\nu$ in Ω_λ^ν .

Proof. Let us assume that there exists a point $x_0 \in \Omega_\lambda^\nu$ such that $w(x_0) = w_\lambda^\nu(x_0)$ and let $r = r(x_0) > 0$ such that $B_r(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega_\lambda^\nu$. We have, in the classical sense, in $B_r(x_0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.13) \quad & -\Delta(w_\lambda^\nu - w) = -\Delta(u_\lambda^\nu - u_0^\nu) + \Delta(u - u_0) \\
 & = \left(\frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} \right) + \left(f(u_0^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) - f(u_0 + w) \right) \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w)^\gamma}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since f is non-decreasing by assumption, $u_0 \leq u_0^\nu$ in Ω_λ^ν by Proposition 3.1 and $w \leq w_\lambda^\nu$ in Ω_λ^ν , we get

$$f(u_0^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) - f(u_0 + w) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, since for $0 < a \leq b$ the function $g(t) := a^{-\gamma} - b^{-\gamma} + (b+t)^{-\gamma} - (a+t)^{-\gamma}$ is increasing in $[0, \infty)$, we also have

$$\left(\frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} \right) \geq 0.$$

and by (4.13) we get

$$-\Delta(w_\lambda^\nu - w) \geq \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w)^\gamma}.$$

Since $u_0^\nu(x_0) > 0$, arguing as in Lemma 4.2, we find $\Lambda > 0$ such that, eventually reducing r , it results $\frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0^\nu + w)^\gamma} + \Lambda(w_\lambda^\nu - w) \geq 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$, so that

$$-\Delta(w_\lambda^\nu - w) + \Lambda(w_\lambda^\nu - w) \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_r(x_0).$$

By the strong maximum principle [10] it follows $w_\lambda^\nu - w \equiv 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$, and by a covering argument $w_\lambda^\nu - w \equiv 0$ in Ω_λ^ν , proving the result. $\square$

5. SYMMETRY

Proposition 5.1. *Let $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be a solution to (1.1). Let w be given by (1.2). Then, for any*

$$a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$$

we have

$$(5.14) \quad w(x) < w_\lambda^\nu(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\lambda^\nu.$$

Moreover

$$(5.15) \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu.$$

Finally, (5.14) and (5.15) hold true replacing w by u .

Proof. Let $\lambda > a(\nu)$. Since $w > 0$ in Ω by Lemma 4.2 we have:

$$w \leq w_\lambda^\nu \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega_\lambda^\nu.$$

Therefore, assuming that $\mathcal{L}(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)$ is sufficiently small (say for $\lambda - a(\nu)$ sufficiently small) so that Proposition 4.4 applies, we get

$$(5.16) \quad w \leq w_\lambda^\nu \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\lambda^\nu,$$

and actually $w < w_\lambda^\nu$ in Ω_λ^ν by the Strong Comparison Principle (Lemma 4.5).

Let us define

$$\Lambda_0 = \{\lambda > a(\nu) : w \leq w_t^\nu \text{ in } \Omega_t^\nu \text{ for all } t \in (a(\nu), \lambda]\}$$

which is not empty thanks to (5.16). Also set

$$\lambda_0 = \sup \Lambda_0.$$

By the definition of $\lambda_1(\nu)$, to prove our result we have to show that actually $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1(\nu)$.

Assume otherwise that $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1(\nu)$ and note that, by continuity, we obtain $w \leq w_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu$. By the Strong Comparison Principle (Lemma 4.5), it follows $w < w_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ unless $w = w_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu$. Because of the zero Dirichlet boundary conditions and since $w > 0$ in the interior of the domain, the case $w \equiv w_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ is not possible. Thus $w < w_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu$.

We can now consider δ given by Proposition 4.4 so that the Weak Comparison Principle holds true in any sub-domain Ω' if $\mathcal{L}(\Omega') \leq \delta$. Fix a compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu$ so that $\mathcal{L}(\Omega_{\lambda_0}^\nu \setminus \mathcal{K}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$. By compactness we find $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$w_{\lambda_0}^\nu - w \geq 2\sigma > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{K}.$$

Take now $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ sufficiently small so that $\lambda_0 + \bar{\varepsilon} < \lambda_1(\nu)$ and, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$

- a) $w_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu - w \geq \sigma > 0$ in $\mathcal{K}$,
- b) $\mathcal{L}(\Omega_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu \setminus \mathcal{K}) \leq \delta$.

Taking into account a) it is now easy to check that, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$, we have that $w \leq w_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu$ on the boundary of $\Omega_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu \setminus \mathcal{K}$. Consequently, by b), we can apply the Weak Comparison Principle (Proposition 4.4) and deduce that

$$w \leq w_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu \setminus \mathcal{K}.$$

Thus $w \leq w_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu$ and by applying the Strong Comparison Principle (Lemma 4.5) we have $w < w_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu$ in $\Omega_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}^\nu$. We get a contradiction with the definition of λ_0 and conclude that actually $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1(\nu)$. Then (5.14) is proved.

It follows now directly from simple geometric considerations and by (5.14) that w is monotone non-decreasing in $\Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu$ in the ν -direction. This gives

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu,$$

so it is standard to deduce (5.15) from Proposition 4.3.

To prove that (5.14) and (5.15) hold true replacing w with u , just recall that

$$u = u_0 + w,$$

and exploit Proposition 3.1. □

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now a direct consequence of Proposition 5.1. Observing that by assumption

$$\lambda_1(\nu) = 0,$$

we can apply Proposition 5.1 in the ν -direction to get

$$u(x) \leq u_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_0^\nu.$$

and in the $(-\nu)$ -direction to get

$$u(x) \geq u_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_0^\nu.$$

Therefore $u(x) \equiv u_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu(x)$ in Ω . The monotonicity of u follows by (5.15).

REFERENCES

- [1] H. BERESTYCKI, L. NIRENBERG, On the method of moving planes and the sliding method. *Bulletin Soc. Brasil. de Mat Nova Ser*, **22**(1), 1–37, 1991.
- [2] L. BOCCARDO, A Dirichlet problem with singular and supercritical nonlinearities. *Non. Anal.*, **75**(12) (2012), 4436–4440.
- [3] L. BOCCARDO, AND L. ORSINA, Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **37**(3-4) (2010), 363–380.
- [4] A. CANINO, Minimax methods for singular elliptic equations with an application to a jumping problem. *J. Differential Equations*, **221**(1) (2006), 210–223.
- [5] A. CANINO, AND M. DEGIOVANNI, A variational approach to a class of singular semilinear elliptic equations. *J. Convex Anal.*, **11**(1) (2004), 147–162.
- [6] A. CANINO, M. GRANDINETTI AND B. SCIUNZI, A jumping problem for some singular semilinear elliptic equations. *preprint*.
- [7] M.G. CRANDALL, P.H. RABINOWITZ AND L. TARTAR, On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity. *Comm. P.D.E.*, **2** (1977), 193–222.
- [8] J. A. GATICA, V. OLIKER, P. WALTMAN, Singular nonlinear boundary value problems for second order ordinary differential equations. *J. Differential Equations*, **79** (1989), 62–78.
- [9] B. GIDAS, W. M. NI, AND L. NIRENBERG, Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **68** (1979), 209–243.
- [10] D. GILBARG, N. S. TRUDINGER, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. *Reprint of the 1998 Edition*, Springer.
- [11] N. HIRANO, C. SACCON, AND N. SHIOJI, Multiple existence of positive solutions for singular elliptic problems with concave and convex nonlinearities. *Adv. Diff. Eq.*, **9** (2004), 197–220.
- [12] N. HIRANO, C. SACCON, AND N. SHIOJI, Brezis-Nirenberg type theorems and multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular elliptic problem. *J. Differential Equations*, **245**(8) (2008), 1997–2037.
- [13] A.V. LAIR AND A.W. SHAKER, Classical and weak solutions of a singular semilinear elliptic problem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **211**(2) (1977), 371–385.
- [14] A.C. LAZER, P.J. MCKENNA, On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary-value problem. *Proc. AMS*, **111** (1991), 721–730.
- [15] J. SERRIN, A symmetry problem in potential theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **43**(4), (1971), 304–318.
- [16] M. SQUASSINA, Boundary behavior for a singular quasi-linear elliptic equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **393**(2), (2012), 692–696.
- [17] C.A. STUART, Existence and approximation of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. *Math. Z.*, **147** (1976), 53–63.

* DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNICAL, PONTE PIETRO BUCCI 31B, 87036 ARCAVACATA DI RENDE, COSENZA, ITALY.

E-mail address: canino@mat.unical.it, grandinetti@mat.unical.it, sciunzi@mat.unical.it